REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-13, 15-20, 22, and 23 are currently pending, wherein claims 1-3, 6, 8, 11, 13, 16, 19, 20 and 23 have been amended and claims 4, 14, and 21 have been canceled. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the remarks presented herein below.

In paragraph 1 of the Office action ("Action"), the Examiner objects to claim 6 because of a typographical error. Applicants hereby amend claim 6 to correct the typographical error, thereby addressing the Examiner's concerns.

In paragraph 3 of the Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1, 2, 6-12, and 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0056026 to Anuff et al. ("Anuff"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

In order to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102, the cited reference must teach each and every claimed element. In the present case, claims 1, 2, 6-12 and 16-18 are not anticipated by Anuff because Anuff fails to disclose each and every claimed element as discussed below.

Independent claims 1, 8 and 19 have been amended to include the subject matter of canceled claims 4, 14, and 21 respectively. Accordingly, independent claims 1, 8, and 19 each recite that the framework includes a plurality of containers configured to accept one or more modules, wherein if one of said plurality of containers does not contain a module, the container shrinks thereby effectively disappearing when the user interface is displayed.

MKM/PLC/vd

As noted by the Examiner, nowhere in Anuff is there any disclosure or suggestion of "containers adapting to content", much less shrinking as claimed. Accordingly, independent claims 1, 8, and 19 are patentable over Anuff because Anuff fails to discloses each and every claimed element.

Claims 2, 6, 7, 9-12, and 16-18 variously depend from independent claims 1 and 8. Therefore, claims 2, 6, 7, 9-12, and 16-18 are patentable over Anuff for at least those reasons presented above with respect to claims 1 and 8. Accordingly, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 6-12, and 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. §102.

In paragraph 13 of the Action, the Examiner rejects claims 3, 4, 13, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Anuff in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0089546 to Kanevsky et al. ("Kanevsky"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

In order to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103, the Examiner must establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness three criteria must be met. First, there must be some motivation to combine the cited references. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the combination must teach each and every claimed element. In the present case, claims 3, 4, 13, and 14 are not rendered unpatentable by the combination of Anuff and Kanevsky for at least the reason that the combination fails to disclose each and every claimed element as discussed below.

MKM/PLC/vd

Independent claims 1 and 8 have been amended to include the subject matter of canceled claims 4 and 14. Accordingly, independent claims 1 and 8, and claims 3 and 13 which depend there from, each recite that the framework includes a plurality of containers configured to accept one or more modules, wherein if one of said plurality of containers does not contain a module, the container shrinks thereby effectively disappearing when the user interface is displayed. Accordingly, claims 1, 3, 8, and 13 are patentable over Anuff for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 8.

Kanevsky discloses a graphical user interface (GUI) which is configured to automatically and dynamically size and reshape displayed windows based on the content displayed in the window. More specifically, Kanevsky discloses the GUI include the capability to set a default minimum and maximum size of a dynamically adjustable window such that a particular line will not become smaller or larger than a preset threshold. However, nowhere in Kanevsky is there any disclosure or suggestion of a framework comprising a plurality of containers configured to accept one or more modules, wherein if one of the plurality of containers does not contain a module, the container *shrinks* thereby effectively disappearing when the user interface is displayed.

In rejecting the claims 4 and 14, the Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to "modify [the] adaptable user interface of Anuff, to include the sizing of the frame based on the content" as allegedly disclosed by Kanevsky. However, nowhere in Kanevsky is there any disclosure or suggestion of shrinking the container as claimed. Although Kanevsky does disclose altering the

transparency of a window in order to display hidden windows, the transparent windows of Kanevsky do not shrink as claimed. To the contrary, the size of the transparent window remains the same, it is the pixels of the window which are altered in order to make the window appear transparent.

Since Anuff and Kanevsky both fail to disclose or suggest a framework that includes a plurality of containers configured to accept one or more modules, wherein if one of said plurality of containers does not contain a module, the container shrinks thereby effectively disappearing when the user interface is displayed as claimed, the combination of these two references cannot possibly disclose or suggest said elements. Therefore, even if one skilled in the art were motivated to combine Anuff and Kanevsky, which Applicants do not concede, the combination would still fail to render claims 1, 3, 8, and 13 unpatentable because the combination fails to disclose each and every claimed element. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3, 4, 13, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

In paragraph 16 of the Action, the Examiner rejects claims 5, 15, 19, 22, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Anuff in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0005243 to Olander et la. ("Olander"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 5, 15, 22, and 23 variously depend from independent claims 1, 8, and 19. Therefore, claims 5, 15, 22, and 23 patentable over Anuff for at least those reasons presented above with respect to claims 1, 8, and 19.

MKM/PLC/vd

Olander discloses a method for utilizing look and feel in a graphical user interface. However, Olander fails to overcome the deficiencies of Anuff. Since Anuff and Olander both fail to disclose or suggest a framework that includes a plurality of containers configured to accept one or more modules, wherein if one of said plurality of containers does not contain a module, the container shrinks thereby effectively disappearing when the user interface is displayed as claimed, the combination of these two references cannot possibly disclose or suggest said elements. Therefore, even if one skilled in the art were motivated to combine Anuff and Olander, which Applicants do not concede, the combination would still fail to render claims 5, 15, 19, 22, and 23 unpatentable because the combination fails to disclose each and every claimed element. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 35, 15, 19, 22, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

In paragraph 21 of the Action, the Examiner rejects claims 20 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Anuff, in view of Olander, further in view of Kanevsky. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As discussed above with respect to claim 19, from which claim 20 depends, Anuff, Olander, and Kanevsky each fail to disclose or suggest a framework that includes a plurality of containers configured to accept one or more modules, wherein if one of said plurality of containers does not contain a module, the container shrinks thereby effectively disappearing when the user interface is displayed as claimed. Therefore, even if one skilled in the art were motivated to combine Anuff, Olander, and Kanevsky, which Applicants do not concede, the combination would still fail to render claims 19

MKM/PLC/vd

and 20 unpatentable because the combination fails to disclose each and every claimed element. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 20 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Penny Caudle (Reg. No. 46,607) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: March 30, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By Penny Caudle Reg # 46,607
Michael K. Mutter
Registration No.: 29,680
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant

MKM/PLC/vd